

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed October 27, 2005. Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25, and 31 were rejected. Claims 26-30 and 32-36 were objected to. Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-19, and 21-36 have been canceled. New claims 37-61 have been added. Claims 20 and 37-61 are currently pending in the application.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 26-30 and 32-36 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated that these claims would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for consideration of these claims. The new claims 37-46 recite substantially the same limitations as claims 26-30 and 32-36 (which are now canceled). Applicant thus respectfully submits that claims 37-46 are allowable.

Applicant has also added new claims 47-61 which recite similar limitations as the allowable subject matter, and respectfully submits that these claims are also allowable. For example, claim 47 recites in pertinent part, “stopping execution of the test executive sequence in response to first user input after the first snapshot is performed” and “re-starting execution of the test executive sequence from the step at which the first snapshot was performed in response to second user input, wherein said re-starting uses information from the first snapshot”. The prior art does not teach stopping execution of a test executive sequence in response to first user input and then re-starting execution of the test executive sequence from the step at which the first snapshot was performed, in response to second user input.

Claim 55 recites in pertinent part, “performing a plurality of snapshots of the execution of the test executive sequence,” and “receiving user input selecting a first snapshot from the plurality of snapshots,” and “re-starting execution of the test executive sequence from the step at which the first snapshot was performed in response to the user input selecting the first snapshot”. The prior art does not teach receiving user input

selecting a snapshot from a plurality of snapshots and re-starting execution of a test executive sequence from a step at which the selected snapshot was performed.

Claim 59 recites in pertinent part, “wherein the plurality of steps includes a first step, wherein the first step is configured to cause a snapshot of the execution of the test executive sequence to be performed, wherein performing the snapshot comprises storing information usable to re-start execution of the test executive sequence from the first step”. The prior art does not teach the concept of a step in a test executive sequence that is configured to cause a snapshot of the execution of the test executive sequence to be performed.

Claim Rejections

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,401,216 to Meth et al. (hereinafter “Meth”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,868 to Jenkins et al (hereinafter “Jenkins”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 20 has been amended to clarify that the test executive sequence hierarchy is a tree hierarchy that includes a plurality of test executive sequences related to each other according to a hierarchical tree relationship such that execution of each child test executive sequence in the tree hierarchy is invoked by a parent test executive sequence in the tree hierarchy. In other words, each child test executive sequence is invoked as a subsequence during execution of the child’s respective parent sequence. Jenkins does not teach such a test executive sequence tree hierarchy. Applicant thus respectfully submits that claim 20 is patentably distinct over Meth and Jenkins.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-50100/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: December 27, 2005 JCH/JLB